A U M

The sincere desire to help others acts as a great inlet from our supersensuous consciousness. —ROBERT CROSBIE

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLI June, 1953 No. 8

THE INTENT OF U. L. T.

THIS journal, throughout the years, has but seldom mentioned the United Lodge of Theosophists, even though both the pattern and personnel of THEOSOPHY derive from U.L.T. Such a practice, however, is actually one of the best ways of representing just what "U.L.T." has been about during the forty-four years elapsed since 1909, this policy marking one of those situations wherein refraining from talking *about* something becomes one of the best ways of explaining it.

Conversely, U.L.T. *can* be talked about from time to time without any claims being made for its members, the supposed good results of its existence in general, or present progress being achieved in its many Lodges. For the Declaration of the United Lodge of Theosophists is an avowal of members to eschew entirely mutual congratulations in respect to "associational" progress, certainly so before the public, and to focus their energies upon presenting to that public the *intent* of U.L.T. There is a subtle difference here, yet a whole world of difference, too, since claims are always, whatever their nature, based upon at least some measure of obeisance to status or authority. A "declaration of intent" is simply an affirmative proposal, which others may or may not feel inwardly invited to share in furthering.

The reason, then, for not propagandizing U.L.T. frequently in THEOSOPHY is because any repeated mention of a Name—so frequently are Names advertised to the public—creates a misleading impression. Every issue of THEOSOPHY contains a printing of the Declaration of U.L.T. and that is, perhaps, sufficient.

The first sentence of that Declaration serves as good illustration of the uniqueness of a truly Theosophical document. "Independent devo-

tion"! Devotion is usually regarded as being a matter of group participation—except by the great Theosophists. When H.P.B. speaks of "a solitary Path," when she reminds us that to hear "the voice of the silence . . . thou wilt have to travel on alone," when she writes that the Theosophist is one who considers his only preceptor "the still small voice of his spiritual consciousness," she is indicating the crux of what is implied by the term Theosophy itself. We may remember, too, H.P.B.'s approval of Vaughan's explanation that "a Theosophist is one who gives you a theory of God, or the works of God, which has not revelation, but an inspiration of his own for its basis," and then turn to her own paraphrase, which speaks of the Theosophist as one "with an inspiration of his own to solve the universal problems."

It is for these reasons, perhaps, that there have been relatively few "Theosophists" in recorded history. The common human proclivity, in this particular cycle of materialistic involvement, is to seek the comfort of association with prestige. Men who feel comfortably at home during debates about authorities would often feel quite lost if actually thrown upon their own resources, even though they are perfectly willing to be critics and qualifiers for *all* the authorities, including those most preferred by themselves. But the work of true Theosophy has never been pre-eminently critical. Theosophy is rather an affirmation, or series of affirmations, the influence of which is best expressed through efforts to synthesize and complement the partial truths found in many contradictory "opinions." Therefore, when the Declaration of U.L.T. suggests the ideal attitude as being one "unconcerned with dissensions or differences of individual opinion," this can be taken as but a way of saying that the fact that opinions *are* different is not what is important. What is important is that one can and should, as a Theosophist, adopt the attitude of the student, who is not interested in cataloguing statements and representations as "right" or "wrong," but rather in getting behind their points of circumstantial origin to whatever essential truth may be contained therein. *That* truth is real, whereas everything else, including the emotional zest with which most partisans defend their chosen spokesmen, will pass away with the death of the *personal* man.

The magazine THEOSOPHY was not founded directly by Robert Crosbie, who was the originator of the U.L.T. idea in its present form, but, more significantly, THEOSOPHY was an outgrowth of the U.L.T.

intent, as grasped and energized by first one, and then others, of Robert Crosbie's companions. Two short introductory paragraphs in Letter One of *The Friendly Philosopher,* the collection of Mr. Crosbie's letters and talks during the early days of U.L.T. work, might be called a perfect illustration of the way in which the venture, THEOSOPHY, came naturally into being in the atmosphere engendered:

> You, yourself, have taken a step by your own internal determination to know the truth for the sake of the truth. Your real self is by your trend of thought finding a channel for expression, and this will grow. Right thought must precede right speech and right action. . . .
>
> The Theosophical Movement is greater than any society or organization. The latter are but temporal, changing with the nature and understanding of those who constitute them and influence their policies and ideals; they correspond to our physical bodies, whereas the Movement corresponds to the Soul. There are many kinds of bodies, and work has to be done in each, in acordance with the possibilities afforded by its nature. Those who pin their faith to *any* body are choosing a transitory guide, a frail support.

The intent of U.L.T. is a subtle one, easily misunderstood. Similarly, the policy of THEOSOPHY in respect to the anonymity of editors and contributors has been thought pretentious—a sort of implied claim that what appears on *these* pages is a special revelation of transcendent wisdom, so pure and impersonal that only anonymity can express its universal quality! But such a disguised bid for Authority was not in mind, nor have the founders and helpers of the magazine THEOSOPHY regarded the articles offered as possessing inspired finality. It has been believed, however, that there is the profoundest of philosophical "authority" for maintaining that the modulus set is a good one, one which at least constantly *tends* to depersonalize Theosophic writings.

Every well conceived intention which becomes a modulus for co-operative effort can, of course, then, be abused or improperly represented. Undoubtedly, the original intent of U.L.T. has often and in many ways been subverted in action by its members. Yet so long as it continues to be reiterated that U.L.T. *is* primarily an intent rather than any particular embodiment of its motive, the work accomplished in its name will have a permanent symbolical, as well as a practical and philosophic value.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER

DEAR ———,

Thanks for your good letter. I am glad you are seeing that quietness and calmness under all conditions is the only state that permits of one's best work and judgment. It also evidences strength and permits its expression; it gives confidence to others and helps them; whereas, if one is himself disturbed, others see his weakness, and he does not get the confidence that he might have had from them. Nor, in fact, is he really strong, for he is being continually thrown off his balance and says and does things for which he is afterward sorry. Then he has to spend more time and effort making amends, thus signing and sealing his weakness.

"Be restrained, be liberal, be merciful; it is the death of selfishness." Strive for this. Resolve to speak quietly and with right feeling; don't be impatient with anything or anybody; don't complain for yourself, no matter what happens; bear your ills patiently; be solicitous for the ills of others.

It would be well if you would be more serious and sober in thought; don't joke about persons, or disparage in any way; don't joke about serious things—there is a deep undercurrent of life that is utterly lost to one who swims only on the surface. Always consider the bearing and effect of what you are about to say or do, and think of others first, last, and all the time.

Perhaps this is a large order, but it is too true that you will have to fill it sooner or later, and the sooner is infinitely the better. Be helpful, but do not call for help for yourself any more than you can possibly avoid.

There are so many things in us that we do not discover or even suspect until something brings the fact before us; then, we are amazed and ashamed at the thought of what we must have said and done under that unsuspected bias. Even then, having observed the operation of our unsuspected bias in some particulars, we are satisfied that we have ousted the intruder, and continue to feed him in some other way—in small ways, perhaps, but the root may be still there. The task needs constant watchfulness, and at times will seem endless and hopeless.

NOTE.—From a hitherto unpublished letter by Robert Crosbie.

But, of course, it is *not* "endless, hopeless, and restricting," for these ideas are only wiles of the intruder to cause us to desist or "let up," in some degree. Krishna's advice to Arjuna is good to keep in mind, "Having placed thine arrow in the bow, hit the mark."

We reach a point in each life quickly that marks the place we reached in another life, and then comes the struggle to pass that barrier. It so often means a complete change of thought and action, and we should be prepared to take it, if we desire to be the better able to help and teach others. Of course, you know this all, and, no doubt, might have tried harder and more persistently, earlier, but the time comes when a choice and strong effort are necessary. It may be that this is the time; at all events, you can make it so, and do away with much in yourself that you find of hindrance and that prevents you from doing the best and most.

As ever,
R. C.

Another Letter

My dear _____

Your sketch of a plan for the working of branches of the T.S. came duly to hand. Please accept my thanks for the same. Now will you add a little more to the obligation by doing a little more thinking for me. I have in mind publishing in the "Path" from time to time subjects for discussion at the meetings of the branches, the discussion of these subjects being entirely voluntary, but done so nearly as possible in the same week by those which accept the suggestions. The harvest is so full that it grieves me constantly that the workers are not more ready. That there are workers waiting, and many of them too, I know, but they do not seem to know how to begin work. A little infusion of courage, of zeal, of faith and of confidence is all that is needed. That which I can do is not only little, but others fail to receive the benefits which would accrue to them by doing on their own parts. Our members must not forget that they must rise by action, and by long, hard, steady action, to a higher state. It will not do for them to lie like hungry birds in the nest waiting with open bills for the mother to bring them food. They must out and search for their own food.

—W. Q. Judge

THE USES OF PHILOSOPHY

THE purposes of the Theosophical Movement have been variously and extensively defined by H. P. Blavatsky, William Q. Judge, and others, so that no one really interested need remain in ignorance on this subject. In the familiar terms of the Theosophical vocabulary, the over-all end of the Movement is referred to by Mr. Judge as "a change in the Manas and Buddhi of the race." Ethically, the goal is the formation of "the nucleus of a universal brotherhood of Humanity," while at the level of individual morality and development the objective is greater self-reliance and personal responsibility. From what may be termed an "occult" point of view, the Movement seeks to establish in the world a recognizable portal to the path of Adeptship, offering access, for those who choose this path, to guidance in the ancient disciplines by means of which uncertainty and ignorance are exchanged for knowledge, and weakness and vacillation are replaced by concentration and power—power for *good.*

These several ends, we are instructed, are not really separate and distinct, but inwardly related, being, in fact, all aspects of each other and of the larger process of human evolution. How is this unity of purpose to be known and understood, not as a matter of hearsay or doctrine, but intimately, from personal realization? The answer is clear from the study and application of philosophy: The Theosophical *philosophy* is the tool of discovery for the student and aspirant. Indeed, the first step of unification of ideas and purposes is accomplished quite early in the quest, from realization that ethics and metaphysics are inseparable from each other, except as abstractions, and that only application of the principles studied can lead to the sort of experience which transforms theory or belief into actual knowledge.

Two other considerations, however, are of vital importance in understanding the Theosophical Movement. There is first the fact that the Theosophical Movement is not something "new" in the world. Second is the fact that the world itself, the scene and matrix of Theosophical effort, establishes conditions under which Theosophical labors must be pursued. These considerations, we might say, create the need for historical, analytical, and critical studies on the part of the student. Both the Movement and the World have a "past," and every "past"

exerts a limiting effect upon the present and the future, as well as opening up the way to greater possibilities.

If we are willing to take the position that all human history may be regarded as in some sense an expression of Theosophical history—if the pattern of human striving, human failure, and human compromise is no more and no less than the track of the soul in its pilgrimage through matter—then the characteristics of the world become amenable to analysis in terms of Theosophical philosophy. On this basis, "As above, so below," becomes a universal rule, and the laws of analogy and correspondence, through which every macrocosm produces endless microcosmic reflections of itself, are seen as authentic principles of explanation.

There is a sense, also, in which every fallible human institution is a partial version or an inversion of the Theosophical Movement, every mistaken idea a distortion of a true idea, and every injustice a partisan application of an originally universal principle. The limited or partial expression of a universal original is not necessarily, however, to be scorned. The factor of temporal "fitness" or appropriateness must be weighed. A man may be a craftsman, for example, and choose to regard his work as symbolic of the larger "work" of nature—the refabrication and refinement of the raw materials of evolution into a form expressive of a higher intelligence and consciousness. So regarded, his work may assume a meaning of profound suggestiveness for himself and all others who have relations with him. This is a way of practicing what the *Gita* terms "devotion by means of renunciation of action," which, according to Krishna, bears this fruit:

> Whoever in acting dedicates his actions to the Supreme Spirit and puts aside all selfish interest in their result is untouched by sin, even as the leaf of the lotus is unaffected by the waters.

But since man is man, and not yet a god, there is always the possibility that the object of his devotions may change—that his own virtue may grow into a more prominent shrine than the formless altar of the Supreme Spirit. When this happens, a deep corruption sets in, more insidious by far in its effects than any ordinary selfishness or "sins" of the man animated simply by acquisitive motives. The bloodstained pages of history quickly reveal the tragic disaster which ensues when hypocrisy and self-righteousness are permitted to sanctify activities which serve personal ends. Nothing so enrages the human instinct

for justice as the use of religion as a cloak for the seizure of earthly power, and history demonstrates that there is no lie so terrible as that which asserts that the purposes of the Most High may be served by cruelty, deception, and ruthless force. Religious wars, or wars in which religious emotions are exploited and used, are always the most bitterly contested and mercilessly fought.

There is a hard logic, of course, in religious rationalizations—the logic which attaches to any partisan employment or ultimate justification. When a man uses religion or a religious idea in self-justification, he invokes the highest sort of appeal. Disclaiming self-interest, ignorance, or any unworthy motive, he urges that he is obliged by the fiat of the highest morality to act as he does; and since whatever is done in the name of the highest morality must, in the nature of things, be above reproach, his righteousness remains unsullied by the darkest crimes. Thus the Southerners of pre-Civil War days in the United States claimed religious authority for enslaving the Negroes, and found further justification in the fact that Athens, the flower of ancient Greek culture, was in some measure a slavocracy. Thus the South African advocates of *Apartheid* today declare that the rule of white over black men is ordained by God, and that the rulers are responsible only to the God who so ordained.

There are many theories of history concerned with explaining the vicissitudes of European culture and the general rise of Western civilization, but the one which might prove most fruitful for theosophists to consider, in regarding the West as the matrix of the Theosophical Movement of 1875, is the theory which sees in the tumult of these fifteen or twenty centuries a series of rebellions against the abuse of religious authority and the misrepresentation of spiritual ideas. The revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, for example, were deistic and atheistic, but generally humanist in temper. They opposed the oppressions of priestcraft and attacked the idea of supernatural authority, yet preserved a measure of reverence toward the mysteries of nature and the dignity of man. The revolutions of the twentieth century went further. It is as though the hypocrisies and pretenses of religion, having been osmotically transferred from the theocratic societies of the medieval period to the property-loving psychology of the succeeding acquisitive society, caused the revolutions of the twentieth century to attack not only faith in God, but faith in the

motives of man as well. The revolutions of the eighteenth century were celebrated in the name of human freedom, but in the twentieth century, revolutions honored not man, but the authority of the State, presumably necessary to protect us from one another. These were revolutions against all inward morality, replacing the ancient sanctions of either God, conscience, or moral principle, with the political formulations of the party in power.

Thus, in the twentieth century, we have seen the spirit of revolt turned against itself, and made to destroy itself. It is not so strange that, in other relationships, we see ominous portents of the tendency to self-destruction, whether in high rates of suicide throughout the civilized world, in the development of weapons growing out of the discovery of atomic energy, or in the new psychiatric diagnoses which find, in so many instances, men trying to "Escape from Freedom," or as Karl Menninger put it, "Man Against Himself."

The present age, then, while an "age of inquiry," as named by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* is plainly also an age of confusion, in which the bewilderments caused by self-deception and self-betrayal unite with time-sanctioned habits of self-justification. These habits may be identified and exposed for what they are when found in association with institutional claims by religious organizations, yet remain as acquired tendencies in relation to other matters, such as, for example, one's notions of Theosophical "truth." Who can doubt that it was the carry-over by students of Theosophy of typical religious attitudes and hypocrisies—seldom recognized as such—into the affairs of the Theosophical Society which made H.P.B. write almost despairingly of the progress of the Movement, as she did, for instance in the collection of letters later printed under the title, "She Being Dead, yet Speaketh"? Her various articles on occult matters bear similar evidence of the strain felt by an individual of unshakable honesty when obliged to deal with people who seemed unable to distinguish between the inner morality of motive and the outer morality of convention.

One conclusion of such reflections is bound to be that, along with the noble positive objectives of the Movement, as stated in the general characterizations of Theosophy, the work of students has also the crucial psychological purpose of restoring to recognition the true use of *philosophy.* Philosophy may be many things, but it is *never* a means of self-justification. Least of all should it become a source of vanity, in

that those who suppose themselves to "possess" it are somehow favored of the gods. Nor is philosophy ever "possessed" at all, in the way that sectarians may possess their special doctrines.

Theosophy not only fosters self-reliance; its understanding *requires* it, for, unlike the believers in supernatural revelation, the student of Theosophy is unable to rush to a revealed text for vindication of his claims. The very conception of truth proposed by Theosophy prevents any so-easy demonstration, for truth, thus conceived, is a matter of perceptive vision, and not a matter of battering down objections with scripturally authentic citations from The Book. When a theosophist talks to someone of another, or of no particular, persuasion, he is not armed with the "authority of H.P.B.," but with his faith in the potential divinity of every human being. To press any sort of "authority" upon another is not the promulgation of Theosophy, but the suppression or mutilation of its spirit.

Above all, Theosophy teaches the sanctity of the mind and moral nature of all human beings. It is here, perhaps, that the *skandhas* of Western religion play the greatest havoc with would-be students, for how, we have been taught to ask by our psycho-religious inheritance, can the thoughts of another be of any value, or at all important, unless he share *our* first principles and reach our well-esteemed conclusions? How, indeed, unless we take to heart the rule that motive is all, or nearly all, and daily acknowledge to ourselves that the integrity of another man's thought may be more precious in the eyes of the Law, than our own echoed wisdom of the ages, even though he may use a spiritually inverted vocabulary and declare views which seem the opposite of true. This has to do, of course, with private communications, as distinguished from the impersonal forum of opinion, although here, too, H.P.B. made evident in her statement of the editorial policy of her magazine, *Lucifer,* the processes of original thinking are to be respected, wherever they may lead. The fact is that any real thinking is instructive, simply because it represents a mind at work. Opinions may change, and "correct doctrines" grow rigid or suffer misinterpretation, but the living mind is always capable of new reaches of insight. And without living minds, the greatest of truths can find no habitation at all.

We know the reluctance of the Buddha to speak out definitively on doctrinal matters, as witness his silence when questioned by the monk, Vacchagotta, concerning the existence of the Ego. All honor, then, to

H.P.B., who, knowing the hazards of doctrinal disquisition, nevertheless responded to the intellectual needs of the West with ample teachings of doctrine, accepting, so to say, the "Karma" of whatever rigidities and sectarian egotisms might result through the failure of theosophists to recognize that Theosophy is *not* a religion, and cannot be used or rather misused as such.

The uses of philosophy are truly an *esoteric* reality, having a role in human communications only when there is the natural flow of trust and mutual respect. The intent of compulsion or coercion, whether by moral pressure or "authority" is wholly alien to the region of philosophical discourse—witness the long centuries of silence on the part of the protagonists of the Wisdom Religion, during the ages when men were ruled by and seemed to understand and respect only the rough hand of external authority.

It is hardly debatable that the most sorrowful episodes of Theosophical history have been those in which some self-appointed savior of the Movement took upon himself the responsibility of purging the Society of erring members. Here, in almost every case, was repeated the age-old pattern established by self-righteous prophets and purifiers of Western religion. As always, it is the lesser men who assume the greater authority; being lesser, their opinion of their fellows is lower than that of wiser men, and so they rush to adopt organizational solutions to philosophical and moral problems, with results which stand revealed in Theosophical history. Thus Coues' endeavor to manipulate the decisions of H.P.B.—a barefaced political move without the dignity of honest concern for the good of the Society; thus Olcott's attempt to displace Judge from leadership of the American Section, which led, finally, to the break between Judge and Annie Besant, and the eventual reduction of these and other societies to no more than Theosophical "sects."

The welfare of the Movement never has and never will depend upon measures of this sort. The welfare of the Theosophical Movement depends upon what may be called its *philosophical morale*—upon the spirit in which the great, impersonal ideas set afloat in the world by the Founders are received, and how they are used by those who receive them. If there is failure in this, no "political" measures can save the work; and, conversely, with success in philosophy, no attacks, of whatever sort, can harm it.

. . . .

THE PATH OF PROGRESS

MEN boast of material progress. Masters of Wisdom, however, care only for spiritual progress, for the awakenings of the Soul to the light of its own divine nature. It is true that Theosophy speaks of three lines of evolution—the physical, the intellectual, and the spiritual—each of which has its own special place in the scheme of things, but the first two are important only insofar as they are avenues of experience by means of which moral growth is accomplished.

Man's conquest of space with automobiles, boats, television, radar, etc.—are these progress? Not of themselves. They are but glorified permutations of matter, playthings for a time, with which the intellect and psychic nature of man occupy themselves while the work of real progression may be thoughtlessly delayed. Two-hundred-inch telescopes are invented, through which to look deeper and deeper into the objective reaches of space. Microscopes are built, with which we attempt to ken the mysteries of the infinitesimal. Meticulous is our observation of the attitudes and behavior of the atom. Almost endless would be the task of enumerating the achievements of modern Science, and of delineating the uses, on the material plane, to which these achievements can be turned. Are any or all of these things progress? Not necessarily. Not one of the inventions of Science possesses the slightest degree of value, *of itself*. For the real value of anything must be in the extent to which it furthers, either directly or indirectly, the progressive awakenings of Soul. All that exists, exists for the sake of the Soul's experience and emancipation.

Theosophy has no quarrel with Science. It neither denies nor belittles the achievements of the modern age. On the contrary, it holds that they are marvellous and stupendous—and in some cases, even awe-inspiring. How could they be else, to the senses of man, and to the reasonings of his physical brain mind? Nor does Theosophy underrate the possibilities of scientific accomplishment in the future. It holds rather that there can be no earthly limits to research and experimentation, to the ever-widening field of invention, for the conceivable combinations of the elements are infinite. Theosophy maintains only that none of these things can be accounted *real* progress unless incorporated

in a broader scheme of purpose—seen correctly as means rather than as ends. Otherwise the kaleidoscopic patterns of illusion will intrigue the intellect, and divert the energies of aspiring men into matters of incidental importance, while the path of real progress remains untrod. Such is the lure of Maya.

Reality, Theosophically speaking, simply does not lie in the realm of the objective world, nor is it to be discovered by mechanized extensions of our physical senses. True progress requires the development of spiritual faculties, once these are admitted and understood. How is this task to be accomplished, we ask, since a higher-than-usual consciousness obviously must also be evoked. Such progress *does* take place, as is evidenced by a growing respect for the spiritual laws of morality, as opposed to exclusive reliance upon jurisprudence, by greater and greater appreciation of the simple, natural things of life, instead of an insatiable desire for change and complexity, and by an ever-widening perception of the inner nature of things in place of fixations on the objective forms of matter.

While spiritual evolution cannot be sponsored by the intellect, the intellect can and should put the house in order, providing the Divine Ego with a proper environment of idea and a controlled power of concentration through which the Soul may experience and grow. The foremost purpose of H. P. Blavatsky's mission was to unite the *Buddhi* and *Manas* of the race, and at a time of great siftings in the Theosophical Movement, she made the statement that she would die happily if she could succeed in placing on the right path half a dozen or so "real theosophists"—for these could and would become leaders.

The following quotations from the Teachings, collated by a student, help free the mind of many misconceptions, which must be the first step in becoming a "real Theosophist." The only real progress is that which is accomplished *within man himself,* through changes in states of consciousness, which he alone can effect.

> Maya, or illusion, is an element which enters into all finite things, for everything that exists has only a relative, not an absolute, reality, since the appearance which the hidden noumenon assumes for any observer depends upon his power of cognition. To the untrained eye of the savage, a painting is at first an unmeaning confusion of streaks and daubs of colour, while an educated eye sees instantly a face or a landscape. Nothing is permanent except the one hidden absolute existence which contains in itself the noumena of all realities. The

existences belonging to every plane of being, up to the highest Dhyan-Chohans, are, in degree, of the nature of shadows cast by a magic lantern on a colourless screen; but all things are relatively real, for the cogniser is also a reflection, and the things cognised are therefore as real to him as himself. Whatever reality things possess must be looked for in them before or after they have passed like a flash through the material world; but we cannot cognise any such existence directly, so long as we have sense-instruments which bring only material existence into the field of our consciousness. Whatever plane our consciousness may be acting in, both we and the things belonging to that plane are, for the time being, our only realities. As we rise in the scale of development we perceive that during the stages through which we have passed we mistook shadows for realities, and the upward progress of the Ego is a series of progressive awakenings, each advance bringing with it the idea that now, at last, we have reached "reality"; but only when we shall have reached the absolute Consciousness, and blended our own with it, shall we be free from the delusions produced by Maya. (*S.D.* I, 39-40)

Time is only an illusion produced by the succession of our states of consciousness as we travel through eternal duration, and it does not exist where no consciousness exists in which the illusion can be produced . . . (*S.D.* I, 37)

Our ideas, in short, on duration and time are all derived from our sensations according to the laws of Association. Inextricably bound up with the relativity of human knowledge, they nevertheless can have no existence except in the experience of the individual ego, and perish when its evolutionary march dispels the Maya of phenomenal existence. What is Time, for instance, but the panoramic succession of our states of consciousness. In the words of a Master, "I feel irritated at having to use these three clumsy words—Past, Present, and Future—miserable concepts of the objective phases of the subjective whole, they are about as ill-adapted for the purpose as an axe for fine carving. (*S.D.* I, 43-44)

When, therefore, the Secret Doctrine—postulating that conditioned or limited space (location) has no real being except in this world of illusion, or, in other words, in our perceptive faculties—teaches that every one of the higher, as of the lower worlds, is interblended with our own objective world; that millions of things and beings are, in point of localization, around and *in* us, as we are around, with, and in them; it is no metaphysical figure of speech, but a sober fact in Nature, however incomprehensible to our senses. (*S.D.* I, 604-5)

Nothing is added to darkness to make of it light, or to light to make it darkness, on this our plane. They are interchangeable, and scientifically light is but a mode of darkness and *vice versa.* Yet both are phenomena of the same noumenon—which is absolute darkness

to the scientific mind, and but a gray twilight to the perception of the average mystic, though to that of the spiritual eye of the Initiate it is absolute light. How far we discern the light that shines in darkness depends upon our own powers of vision. (*S.D.* I, 41)

. . . there is neither Spirit nor matter, in reality, but only numberless aspects of the One ever-hidden IS (or *Sat*). The homogeneous primordial Element is *simple* and *single only on the terrestrial plane* of consciousness and sensation, since matter, after all, is nothing else than the sequence of our own states of consciousness, and Spirit an idea of psychic intuition. (*S.D.* I, 542)

The power of any and all circumstances is a fixed, unvarying quality, but as *we* vary in our reception of these, it appears to us that our difficulties vary in intensity. They do not at all. We are the variants. (*Letters That Have Helped Me,* I, 35)

Tell the public that now, even as of old, the genuine and sincere observer of life and its underlying phenomena, the intelligent co-worker with nature, may, by becoming an expert in her mysteries thereby become a "wise" man, in the terrestrial sense of the word, but that never will a *materialist* wrench from nature any secret on a higher plane—and you will be laughed to scorn. Add, that no "wisdom from above" descends on any one save on the *sine qua non* condition of leaving at the threshold of the Occult every atom of selfishness, or desire for personal ends and benefit—and you will be speedily declared by your audience a candidate for the lunatic asylum. Nevertheless, this is an old, very old truism. Nature gives up her innermost secrets and imparts *true wisdom* only to him who seeks truth for its own sake, and who craves for knowledge in order to confer benefits on others, not on his own unimportant personality. (William Q. Judge)

Illusion in the Buddhist sense is merely a philosophical rationalization of a concept which at first may have applied literally, and even exclusively, to the mental phenomena described by modern psychiatrists as fixations, unconscious fantasies, and delusions, and the Buddhist doctrines of nonattachment and renunciation, as interpreted by the noblest Buddhist teaching, may mean nonattachment to delusion and renunciation of fantasy, rather than withdrawal from the real world. Judging from his behavior, they seemed to have meant that to the Buddha himself, and to early Buddhists like the great Indian monarch and social reformer, Asoka.

—EDMOND TAYLOR

H.P.B. ON "THE HIDDEN ARTS"

WE believe in astrology as we do in mesmerism and homeopathy. All the three are facts and truths, when regarded as sciences; but the same may not be said of either all the astrologers, all the mesmerists or every homeopathist. We believe, in short, in astrology as a science; but disbelieve in most of its professors, who, unless they are trained in it in accordance with the methods known for long ages to adepts and occultists, will, most of them, remain for ever empiricists and often quacks.

The complaint brought forward by our correspondent in reference to the "class of men coming out of schools and colleges," who, having imbibed Western thought and new ideas, declare that a correct prediction by means of astrology is an impossibility, is just in one sense, and is wrong from another standpoint. It is *just* in so far as a blank, *a priori* denial is concerned, and wrong if we attribute the mischief only to "Western thought and *new* ideas." Even in the days of remote antiquity when astrology and horoscopic predictions were universally believed in, owing to that same class of quacks and ignorant charlatans —a class which in every age sought but to make money out of the most sacred truths—there were found men having the greatest intelligence, but knowing nothing of Hermetic sciences, denouncing the augur and the *abnormis sapiens* whose only aim was a mean desire of, a real lust for, gain. It is more than lucky that the progress of education should have so far enlightened the minds of the rising generations of India as to hinder many from being imposed upon by the numerous and most pernicious and vulgar superstitions, encouraged by the venal Brahmans, and only to serve a mere selfish end of *aura sacra fames* or trading in most sacred things. For, if these superstitions held their more modern forefathers in bondage, the same cannot be said of the old Aryas. Everything in this universe—progress and civilization among the rest—moves in regular cycles. Hence, now as well as then, everything with a pretence to *science* requires a system supported, at least by a semblance of argument, if it would entrap the unwary. And

---

NOTE.—This article first appeared as an Editor's Note by H. P. Blavatsky, in the *Theosophist* for January, 1883.

this, we must allow, native quackery has produced and supplied freely in astrology and horoscopy. Our native astrologers have made of a sacred science a despicable trade; and their clever baits so well calculated to impose on minds even of a higher calibre than the majority of believers in bazaar *horoscopers* lying in wait on the *maïdans,* have a far greater right to pretend to have become a regular science than their modern astrology itself. Unequivocal marks of the consanguinity of the latter with quackery being discovered at every step, why wonder that educated youths coming out of schools and colleges should emphatically declare native modern astrology in India—with some rare exceptions—no better than a humbug? Yet no more Hindus than Europeans have any right to declare astrology and its predictions a fiction. Such a policy was tried with mesmerism, homeopathy and (so-called) spiritual phenomena; and now the men of science are beginning to feel that they may possibly come out of their affray with *facts* with anything but flying colours and crowns of laurels on their heads.

A Basic Relatedness

The sun is older than any of its planets—though younger than the moon. This does not mean that all the planets are thrown out from the sun, as modern Science teaches, but simply that under the Rays of the sun they acquire their growth.

All [planets] began life as wanderers over the face of the infinite Kosmos. They detached themselves from the common storehouse of already prepared material; then, starting on their long journey they first settled in life where conditions were prepared for them and gradually became suns. Then each sun, when its Pralaya arrived, was resolved into millions and millions of fragments. Each of these fragments moved to and fro in space collecting fresh materials, as it rolled on, like an avalanche, until it came to a stop through the laws of attraction and repulsion, and became a planet in our own, as in other systems, beyond our telescopes. Thus the Sun will live in his children as a portion of the parents lives in their offspring.

—H. P. Blavatsky

THE BRIGHTER MORROW

WE look to the future," said the nineteenth-century Messenger of Theosophy; "we are laboring for the brighter morrow." Can there be such a morrow? This is the silent plea of the mass of sorrowing men. Can there be such a morrow, question the intellectually awake, unless selfish human nature be thoroughly purged and reconstructed—and what assurance is there that human nature can ever change? Can there be a golden tomorrow, ask even students of Theosophy, who, acknowledging Karmic law, view the enormous debts mankind daily, nay hourly, piles upon itself. What can offset this vicious circle of repetition, repetition, repetition of the sins of the past? Furthermore, the tangled web of Karma in one single human life is so intricate, how can that of collective humanity ever be unraveled?

Nature provides an analogy which clearly demonstrates that complex lines of causation can be balanced. Consider the familiar illustration of a calm lake. At time of storm, the water is whipped by the winds, downpouring rains cause countless eddies, the lake bottom is churned up, and the pure water muddied. The complexity of the effects confuses the mind and one wonders if adjustment can be achieved, the vibrating molecules of water harmonized and purified. From experience we know that in a fairly short time the mud will settle and complete calmness reign on that lake; so complete, in fact, that it is difficult to conceive its peace ever having been disturbed. Is this not conclusive evidence that the most violent and complicated eruptions can be adjusted if—and it is a big IF—no further disruptive causation is initiated? Humanity *can* iron out its disputes and difficulties if it will cease setting new detrimental causes in motion. Even with respect to our diseased race body, product of many ages of misuse and abuse, it is indicated by one of the Theosophical teachers that a few centuries of right living can restore it to normalcy.

The practical value of such doctrines as Karma and Reincarnation is that their wholehearted and intelligent acceptance imbues one with the absolute conviction that human nature can be changed, that there is sufficient time for each to accomplish the change, that every soul is basically divine, not diabolical, and that the universal law of compensation reigns king of all until the cycle's end. With such ideation as his

basis, any individual can prove to his own satisfaction that human nature is amenable to improvement by simply alchemizing his own imperfect personality!

Humanity *en masse,* however, will never successfully eradicate its short-sighted selfishness; the path must be traveled by individuals. The pattern-setting work cannot continue to be done for us by the Great Pioneer Souls, whose evolutionary consummation was reached, it is said, in prior races and worlds. Such beings can and do provide all-essential teaching, guidance and charting of the way, powerfully illustrated in their own living, but the task of learning and traveling can only be accomplished by each one for himself. The race would gain no meritorious development if its salvation could be vicariously effected. "The work to be done is for the race and *must be done by men and women of the race;* there is no other way."

Yet to accomplish by oneself the end in view might prove a heart-breaking task. Burning alone, one little flame of high resolve can easily be extinguished by the winds of fear, doubt, pessimism. Many flames, joined in one, intensify many times the radiation of warmth and light and can with ease nullify opposing forces. Such a great fire of ceaseless effort on behalf of truth and soul freedom has been fostered and nurtured by the Theosophical Movement. No sectarian label this, no prideful possession of some party, creed, or race. "The Theosophical Movement" is simply a name, among many, to indicate the totality and synthesis of all movements (individual and collective) sincerely serving the moral and mental evolution of the human race and great nature as a whole.

For fuel it requires the sacrifice of the personal nature of each component part. Its light might represent that aspect of the soul of truth which men allow to become focussed on earth. The active intelligent mind is the necessary life-giving oxygen, without which the flame would suffocate, smoulder and die. Those endeavoring to merge themselves with that central fire know it flickers, smokes and blackens with each personal involvement in the maze of superficial world activities and narrow trends of thought and feeling, postponing the time when its radiance can spread to all. On the other hand, no constructive effort, however faulty, is wasted; each purified motive and sustained devotion means a steadier, clearer flame. Thus fed, the torch of hope and wisdom will reach out its fiery tongues, and when soul-starving

• • • •

bigotry and materialism have accomplished their worst, men may be astonished to discover that all along a beneficent force has been burgeoning and multiplying. A civilization of "things" is being replaced by one of enriched thinking and humanitarian living. The infatuation with the world *about* us has been surplanted by appreciation of and exemplification of the vast cosmos within.

Such is a pale glimpse of what can be the promise of the future. It is no naïve dream for sentimentalists, but is within the power of every cause-making, mind-being to create as a fact.

Why then should one not labor for the brighter morrow? "It will hardly fail to result ultimately in the overthrow of error and the triumph of Truth." (*Isis Unveiled* I, viii.)

FUTURE HUMAN EVOLUTION

We believe in no Magic which transcends the scope and capacity of the human mind, nor in "miracle," whether divine or diabolical, if such imply a transgression of the laws of nature instituted from all eternity.

We accept the saying that the human heart has not yet fully uttered itself, and that we have never attained, or even understood, the extent of its powers. Is it too much to believe that man should be developing new sensibilities, and a closer relation with nature? The logic of evolution must teach as much, if carried to its legitimate conclusions. If, somewhere, in the line of ascent from vegetable or ascidian to the noblest man a soul was evolved, gifted with intellectual qualities, it cannot be unreasonable to infer, and believe, that a faculty of perception is also growing in man, enabling him to descry facts and truths even beyond our ordinary ken.

As a Columbus was born to re-discover, and to force the Old World to believe in Antipodal countries, so will there be born scientists who will discover the marvels now claimed by Occultists.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE POWER TO IDENTIFY

THE power to identify with oneself states, things, and conditions probably governs very largely in the whole field of human activity. This power, *Ahankara* by name, translated as egotism, is a mystic and dynamic force, difficult to analyze because so much in use at every moment of waking existence.

The process of identifying something seems to first involve making an image in the consciousness of the individual. The character of the image thus made would necessarily bear a close relation to the person who evolves it, to his successes and failures. Thought images are a kind of personal insignia. They may be seen as a personal debit and credit ledger, which under audit shows the state of inner solvency. Our "entries" are in terms of energies, our psycho-mental balance being dependent upon the expenditures made of those energies. In any case there is no escaping from the "balance" of Karma in the Akashic register. There, liability is permanent until adjustments are made and a balance struck.

Wrong use of the power of identification constructs our problems, for the debtors—our thought-images—ceaselessly react on their creators, guiding and influencing their every act. The condition defined as self-identifying attachment, known to students as the hardest of all conditions to overcome, is a state inferior to the dignity of Man. It is the origin of evil in human life; it arises from ignorance of what we are and how our self-evolved thought-matrices come to be.

According to the quality of force with which a man endows his thought pictures, so shall he be swayed. If he galvanizes them by uncertainty, or antipathy, so will their nature be determined. Man's thoughts are magnets—more, they are indeed living potencies bearing each the *imprimatur* of the human will. A thought, upon leaving the brain, is said to coalesce with an elemental force, selecting, in its own likeness and kind, from the vast resources of Nature. The murderous thought, as it leaves the mind of the potential criminal, can but attract and vitalize entities of like inclination from Nature's Graveyard, the Kamaloka. These attractions become real forces, psychic vampires, invited by men into their own sphere; they are the curbs which man thus voluntarily places upon his own evolutionary Pilgrimage.

• • • •

Similarly, the man in a mental rut keeps himself there by creating energies and feelings with which he then identifies himself. Outlook and attitude thus determine all. By outlook and attitude one polarizes his magnets. Upon this qualification depends the kind of entities which "people his currents in space." Upon the image depends, in turn, the power for good or ill on others. Man, it is taught, alone of all the beings populating the Cosmos, has the faculty of giving unrestrained, purposive, conscious direction to Energy for weal or woe, moulding progressively or retrogressively at every moment throughout the Manvantara.

The most ignoble use made of the power of identification lies, perhaps, in the impulses given to what we are pleased to call the lower kingdoms. The energy used for the production of human thought and act is not the undiluted private property of man, for all energy is sentient and is used by men upon lease. We borrow it at the cost of improving it, at the price of impelling those kingdoms further onward toward our own Manasic stage. And as all the lives of Nature without exception are conscious, sensitive, reflecting and recording points, bondage among our younger brothers is—human bondage. Man causes the travail of the kingdoms, nor will it end till man ceases to perpetuate it, by learning to see the real nature of all things and thus make the right use of Energy.

To cease identifying ourselves with objects we must pronounce ourselves for what *we* are, and the fruits of the exercise of powers for what *they* are. The true Self and the compounded self of this evolutionary stage are not homogeneous entities. No Manasic Being can confuse his productions, be they direful or celestial, with the Self. The man who knows will never admit doubt of his ability to perform, or irresoluteness of purpose, even though he fail to achieve at any given point in space or time. Such a man has come to the point of realizing himself as "none of the works" which, in the human kingdom, are involved as is the fire in smoke. A wise man, in short, does not use the priceless power of Ahankara to identify faults, which all men possess, with the faultless, unconditional Spectator. Rather, he attributes each "failure" to its source—the mental, moral, psychical, or physical principle in which it originated.

There is doubtless a higher use to which Ahankara can be put, consequent upon a broadening of attitude and outlook. Identification, a

flame of soul power, if supported by altruism rather than by personal concerns, becomes *spiritual identity,* or realization of the Monadic sameness of all beings.

Insufficiently sustained faith results in unsustained effort. Unless unreserved faith is held in one's spiritual powers, how can those confirmations of the magic wells of inner life, human and cosmic, be divulged by the Spirit? The Self aids those in Its service.

A Cultural Detour

Time was when man was the chief object of his own attention, interest and study. We have changed all that. Nature has usurped the pride of place, and we are told to think of ourselves as mere incidents in a process. The modern view fuses man and things. Men are merely things of one kind among innumerable things of other kinds. That light travels at the rate of 186,000 miles a second rather than at 146,000, makes me neither glad nor sorry, any more than does the proportion of the electrons to the protons in an atom of oxygen; but that we are glad or sorry at any time, or at any thing, is, it seems, utterly irrelevant.

Time was when man's presence on the earth gave it dignity amid the heavenly host, when the intellectual systems magnified mankind, exalted the mind and assigned it great place in the hierarchy of creation. 'What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving, how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god!' Hamlet was, of course, mad, and only a madman could say such things. One must admit that it is hard for the plain man to accept what the philosophers and men of science tell him is the truth.

—Macneile Dixon

"SERVANTS, PRIESTS, COUNSELLORS"

> And when the rough work was completed, when the human temple was erected, many more ages would be required for all the servants, the priests, and the counsellors to learn their parts properly so that man, the Master, might be able to use the temple for its best and highest purposes. —*The Ocean of Theosophy*

NO student will ever deny to the human temple its unseen inhabitants, a race of thinkers, planners, *Builders.* Generally these are called forces, of which man possesses every kind: magnetic, sympathetic, antipathetic, nervous, dynamic, occult, mechanical, mental. They disclose, it is said, man's lineage and descent from the Cosmic Forces. Those lowest in the scale, the physical forces which are all biological in their essence, are the vehicles of the higher forces in man known as intellectual and moral. Their totality and commingling constitute the *Ego;* they are the very essence of his being. Ever at work in their ceaseless task of conserving and renewing the organism, these hierarchies are the potencies, senses, faculties of man's several principles. They are sometimes referred to as "breaths," "currents," "fires," "airs." At the heart of all is the Great Breath, the Living Fire, LIFE, which is One but lives Proteus-like under varied forms.

As the cells of the body are grouped upon the principle of hierarchies, each smaller group being subservient to a larger, and all to the whole, so with the subtler agencies which underlie the life of outward accord. Earth and even solar space have their circulating electrical and fluid currents which nourish the greater macrocosm; thus also in the human astral microcosm. There are grades of "servants, priests, and counsellors" attendant upon the sheaths of the Soul from finest to grossest. All possess complementary qualities. All support one another.

Every center in the astral body has its appropriate correspondent in the physical, the two being linked during earthly tenures. Above both, but not apart from, dwells Mind. Claiming occupancy herein is also Kama, desire, and the human temple vibrates in response to the impulses of this principle. Throughout the life of the body prevails the law of sacrifice. "Fiery" lives provide nourishment for other life-atoms called "the Builders," by sacrificing themselves in the shape of vital constructive energy. All forces are dual in character and action: the

Builders are thus restrained by the "fiery lives" from assuming their other aspect of Destroyers, and compelled instead to build up the body and its cells. Direction comes from the "priests." These are energic intelligences, vital currents having their own residence and station throughout the body, and are said, allegorically, to be the seven tongues of that which dwells in their midst, the "Vaishvanara-fire sevenfold"—or the Self. According to its animal needs and desires the body originates electro-vital sparks which illuminate the field of consciousness of the lower self. These sparks are conveyed by the subtle inner avenues of currents to the mind where they awaken reminiscences of those needs. Impressions thus conveyed are of necessity physical, psychic or mental, according to their source.

The health of the body depends upon the integration of all its parts, more especially upon their harmonious association and cooperation. A diseased tissue is one in which a group of cells refuses to cooperate, wherein is set up discordant action, some cells using less or claiming more than their due share of food or energy. The latter energy is *animal vitality,* diffused in all nature and acting according to the conditions it finds for its activity. The animal tissues absorb it according to their more or less morbid or healthy state.

Says H. P. Blavatsky: "If there is one thing more than another which paralyzes the will-power in man and thereby paves the way for physical and moral degeneration, it is intemperance in eating. When too severe strain is made upon the vital energies by overtasking the digestive machinery, the best and only remedy is to let it rest for some time and recoup itself as much as possible. Exhausted ground must lie fallow before it will yield another crop." Foods are crystallized forms of energy. They are Life's products and the spoken images of Nature; and the road to reincarnation, according to William Q. Judge, leads through "certain foods and none other." The germ cells necessary for the production of human bodies require special sustenance; hence the connection of food with the Ego.

Man, however, is a correlation of spiritual powers, as well as a correlation of chemical and physical forces. He comes into full function through the agency of what are called "principles," of which it is stated there are seven. The scale of seven inheres even in the organic processes of assimilation and imbibition, the body being known to possess seven great "plexuses" as well as its "forty-nine fires." Food

once taken into the body, too, can be said to pass through a cycle of seven transformations. According to Ayurveda this cycle occupies about thirty days, or one lunar month. The process of these transformations is carried out by the agencies of the finer forces and currents, the vital fires and airs, and involves seven mutations of food which are equivalent to seven successive "digestions."

The seven respective systems of the physical organic nature are known to *Tridosha* as chyle, blood, flesh (muscle), fat (glands), bone, marrow, and sperm. Each such support of body (*dhatu*) is endowed with a threefold faculty of digestion. That food, for example, which has already been converted into the first system—chyle—is again digested. In its present chylized form it is split up into three parts, one of which remains in the permanent chyle structure, a second being passed on in a finer state to the next *dhatu*—that of blood. A third part is eliminated as unessential waste. The identical procedure of condensing, transmuting and eliminating is repeated next in the blood system, which in turn passes on a still finer essence to the third system—flesh. Thus on through the septenary gamut until the seventh and highest *dhatu* is reached, when that which was food has passed from its last alchemy into germ cell and sperm.

So long as equilibrium and cooperation obtain among the seven systems, the Ego dwells at peace in the temple, yet habitation of this type is not the rule. The karma of ill-health tends ever to disrupt the calm and steady pilgrimage, due far more, doubtless, to the bitterness and astringency of *inner* "foods" of which the physically *kamic* are only pale shadows. The seeds of disease, product of thought now transformed into cause beyond our control, are located primarily in the mind. When the hour strikes for their coming forth they begin to exhaust themselves through channels which carry the appropriate vibrations down upon the physical plane. These are seeds which *may sprout again and again,* as both physical and mental diseases. Therapies are effective when, and only when, they serve in restoring harmony.

The descending currents *are* the disordered forces, the disease *per se.* Drugs which do not promote building and equilibrium among the life-atoms, promote destruction of the cells by further derangement of the vital harmonies which are health. Gross chemical forces in crude medicines easily paralyze vital centers. The laboring Builders often, too, are thus given the impetus to turn Destroyers.

Known to Theosophists is the story of Clovis of France, who was said to be later reborn Frederic III of Prussia (THEOSOPHY 35: 18). At one point of its life as Clovis, the Soul-Ego, the Tenant inhabiting "the Form," was prompted by the surge of old savage instincts to the murder of a prophetess belonging to an alien faith, by means of a sword-point piercing the throat. In the incarnation centuries later, as Frederic, this Soul-Ego reaps the karma through a finally voiceless Form which dies of cancer of the throat. The disease was "absolute" —it lent itself to no known treatment—for this entity "had imprinted on his own immortal mind the deformed picture of his victim." Certain of the finer currents, among them being one called the "Upward" (Udana) which has its locus in the human throat and is said also to be chief among the vital airs, were thus fixed unalterably in the derangement caused by the downward vibrations. The Builder-lives, performing their work upon the matrix as provided, could but faithfully copy "the deformed picture of the victim."

Another illustration of *karmic* disease is found related of the young man with incurable anaemia from birth, who, according to the psychic revelator, "five incarnations previously had spilt much blood in seizing control of the country as Peruvian ruler." (THEOSOPHY 40: 107.) Here the disease points principally to the blood system, the second *dhatu;* and the presence of a derangement of inveterate type among the forces having to do with the production of blood is easily inferred.

It is, certainly, in any case, individual man who is creator and destroyer, who raises up Nemesis against himself. Thus it might be surmised that a final, or supreme penalty—appertaining to the plane of body and disease—is reserved for the last *dhatu,* germ plasm and sperm. For this seventh system too may be destroyed by the unregulated imagination. Here it is that is met the severest karma of all, that karma governing the production of the human temple for the returning Soul—which is also the karma standing at the root of human misery. . . .

> Complete the physical plasm, the "Germinal Cell" of man with all its material potentialities, with the "spiritual plasm," or the fluid that contains the five lower principles of the six-principled Dhyan—and you have the secret, if you are spiritual enough to understand it. . . . in man, the germ must receive the fruition of all the five. Otherwise he will be born no higher than an animal; namely, a congenital idiot. (*S.D.* I, 224.)

• • • •

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

IF a person were not performing his job as well as might be expected, would it be better to leave the job so his employer could get someone more competent, or should he stay, although it might take a long time to improve his ability to do a good job?

This seems to be a question of judgment, and the question naturally arises as to who shall be the evaluator in such a case. Is the person employed in a position where he may judge his abilities? Usually, the employer should be the one to decide whether or not the employee is equipped to do the job at hand—although the successful performance of some jobs depends on self-initiative.

Does evaluation of one's work—or, more correctly, *partial* evaluation—indicate, in the terms of the *Gita,* interest in the fruit of actions? We are faced with two alternatives: First, to regard judgment as in the domain of The Law of Karma, while we seek to be "averse neither to those works which fail nor those which succeed." In this context, one's duty is to work at those tasks immediately confronting one, giving up the results as a true "renouncer." The implication here is that full attention on putting our best energies forward on the job is not possible if there is preoccupation with success or failure, or attachment to the outcome. Second, along with philosophical acceptance of situations as they are, there should be—if a real working out of "specific" Karma is to be accomplished—a positive attempt to judge *oneself* "as from afar," by "oneself" really meaning the nature and quality of one's efforts. This certainly means being concerned with efficiency and productivity, for these represent conscientiousness, but does not have to mean "attachment to results." Thus a synthesis of these two partial truths alone brings psychological constancy to the individual without sacrificing any part of his working capacity.

Besides implying the passing of self-judgment, the original question holds the potential ingredients for discussion of employer-employee relationships, which also need to be examined here. This aspect of the question, the employer-employee relationship, calls forth specific considerations and is directly linked to one's self-evaluation of work. Constructive self-evaluation is achievable only through *objectivity* and *background* (experience plus working-knowledge). "Objectivity," *i.e.,*

seeing one's work as though it was another's, is psychologically similar to "leaving of results to Law." But since any worker who is not fully experienced doesn't have adequate background, it is impossible for him to judge, in a final sense, either his efforts or "successes" without the advice of one with such knowledge. The natural source for such advice is the employer or "boss," but sometimes, due to circumstances or unreasonable attitudes, this source is "blocked." Thus a senior worker in many cases may fulfill the function. With good advice and constructive criticism assisting, intelligent and continued effort can both solve one's own problem and at the same time supply an example in attitude for other new members of personnel.

One can only do his best. If his attitude demands absolute perfection in the rendering of his job, he is not apt to be satisfied with any job. Such an attitude indicates his failure to recognize his real capacities and limitations, for instead there is an identification with an imaginary "ideal self"—a present illusion. Honesty and realism are the only tonics for this psychological malady. Until this is realized, the lesson which a man must learn through certain circumstances will pursue him to the next job and the next. "Hearing" about the law of Karma, however, may add a steadying note and set one to looking to the "Why" of things. Better situations must be earned. Perhaps the efforts of the Theosophist so striving help others with similar shortcomings.

Why is it that whenever Theosophy is mentioned people close their minds to it? If you call it something else, philosophy, truth or nature, they will listen to it and see its reasonableness.

The present generation has been negatively conditioned by sectarianism to be distrustful of patterns of belief. People just don't trust any particular system of thought. History shows that philosophy or political or economic schemes based on anything less than universal laws have only helped this disillusionment.

Although science is gradually approaching a more rational explanation of life, most are still clinging to a pragmatic conception of the meaning of life. One meets many people who are willing to listen for awhile, then smile indulgently, and go on their ways. A student should observe, and exercise discrimination until such a time comes when he will know whom to speak to, and when to stop speaking.

Once ideas are *labeled* "Theosophy," some immediately feel that here is something in opposition to their own thoughts, a reaction which

• • • •

fails to leave an opening for seeing the *similarity* of Theosophical ideas and all sincere convictions. The important thing, it would seem, would be for the ideas to spread. Perhaps when people see the logic of the ideas, they will become open-minded enough to accept the name. If a person were able to listen to ideas, he might become interested enough to know where more of such ideas could be found. He might then be ready for the name *Theosophy.* Another thing, though—Theosophy is powerful. As Mr. Crosbie said, even the name has power—or else so many wouldn't misuse it. Perhaps, unconsciously, people feel, at the mention of the name, the dynamic force of the philosophy and its knowers, which, although in the world for the salvation of every soul, must of necessity spell the downfall of every partial dogma and belief.

What is the value of giving one's life for a principle? What factors might enter the case in deciding?

(a) In a smaller degree, the various decisions one makes in his daily life might be considered a parallel. Aspiring to perfect daily habit and thought in time will accumulate judgment and ability to see along the "razor's edge"—until, finally, our higher power of direct intuition will prevail.

The world at large would consider it an eccentricity to sacrifice one's life for an ideal or principle. Yet because of some men who died for principles, many of our spiritual and physical freedoms have been bequeathed to us. Those men had the *vision* of the future. They knew the law of life—of sowing and reaping, and rendering mercy, and saw these things as bigger than continuance of their own personal life or health.

All men act on motive, whether consciously or not. Some daily give portions of their lives for "principles"; these principles may be mere will-o-the-wisps, or they may be timeless, true, and real. In each case, though, the sacrifice involved at least contributes to self-discipline.

A study of the true psychology of man, his nature, and his ideal—would shatter his delusions and start him on a track that would enable him to understand *his* actions, those of nature, and also every kind of reaction. The value of sacrifice grows only with one's gradual perception of the immutable truths of the universe. But how can any act be measured except over the "long-course" of Re-incarnations, guided by Karma?

(b) The motive behind the decision may throw a determining light on the value of such a decision, although this cannot always be the deciding factor. Good motive does not always mean that the man, held back by a human tendency to error, is doing the right thing. His decision to give up his life might weaken his principle in the world rather than strengthen it.

(c) Physical existence is a valuable thing to a soul since it is the only means of soul-development. To vow, then, to give one's life for a principle, one needs to consider various factors.

A principle might be confused with a hard-and-fast rule. We know that "Honesty is the best policy" and can call this a principle, but to follow this principle does not call for always speaking unpleasant truths. Here we see that a principle might mislead one if it is not wedded to other ideals. A principle does not prescribe a particular action, but is more of an attitude toward things.

We have to consider also our karmic duties to others. Life's problems are choices between comparative values, most often, and we need to remember already assumed responsibilities. Yet it is an important sign that one be *moved* to sacrifice for the sake of an idea. This feeling can always be put to work, if not spectacularly, then in the many small duties that face us daily.

Why are the three fundamentals of Theosophy continuously presented in the traditional order of omnipresent Deity, natural law, and the identity of perfectibility of life? Is this only because "H.P.B. did it that way"?

Obviously, to establish a superphysical doctrine of cosmogenesis in terms of *emanations* must involve positing the reality of a *source-principle.* Philosophy as a whole, according to the Britannica, consists "of two main divisions—epistemology, the doctrine or theory of knowing, and ontology, the science of that which truly is." And, theosophically speaking, both the *power* of cognition or perception and Absolute Consciousness belong in the domain of the First Fundamental.

However, examination of such a study-class procedural tradition should be both provocative and instructive. We must admit that repetition is common to habit, custom, and ritual. Acceptance, lack of concentration, and unreasoned conviction often accompany repetition. Yet the dangers these tendencies engender, *i.e.,* dogmatism and ritual-

• • • •

ism, are lessened in direct proportion to the inspiration and originality of the speaker. The force of habit nevertheless is not unmanifest.

We are reminded of a "bull session" with a materialistic (although humanitarian) socialist, during which an attempt was made to represent Theosophic philosophy by establishing first principles. Unfortunately, without a second thought, we commenced by trying (futilely, it was later found) to lay the grounds for "the philosophy" by way of discussing the highly abstract, metaphysical, "Immutable PRINCIPLE on which all speculation is impossible." This approach erected an initial obstacle which pretty much disconcerted subsequent efforts directed at developing the other fundamentals. Perhaps the wrong level for reasonable discussion was chosen—at least for this man, and perhaps significant mistakes of this sort are likely when habit channels expression; repetition, too, can discourage original thought.

A *functional* approach in the case mentioned, might have proved much better. For instance, by starting with the humanitarian concept of the fundamental identity of all human beings (which has a parallel in Socialist idealism) some sort of contact might have been established.

Operating from a functional basis, the order of presenting the fundamental propositions would be naturally determined by the text, subject-matter, or bent of the inquirer's mind. Not by tradition. Did not H.P.B. generally employ this style in her *Key?* Not one of the three fundamentals is there considered in a doctrinal systematic sense until page 41, when she begins to discuss "The Common Origin of Man." If considering, say, Chapter II of the *Ocean,* which deals expressly with Cosmogenesis, a study class would quite logically treat of the fundamentals in the order "One-Two-Three." The *first* chapter, however, might stimulate an initial positing of the Third Fundamental, for this chapter deals with the Masters as living proof of the Perfectibility of MAN.

The "functional" technique also seems more universally applicable to the affairs of everyday. Depending upon whom we are speaking to, and the circumstances and opinions which influence him, some particular tenet of Theosophy is more likely than any other to stimulate an affinity of thought. It depends upon our sensitivity of perception and common sense to judge where a common language may most easily be found.

NOTES ON THE KEY

ANY extended commentary on one of H. P. Blavatsky's books is bound to serve at least one function—the writer is rewarded by a better understanding of what H.P.B. meant by referring to her monumental *Secret Doctrine* as simply a collection of "a few truths." The essential point she had in mind, we may well think, is that students should never be allowed to feel that "Theosophy" is ever completely encompassed by them, wrapped up in a neat and final package. No one, she said, possesses Theosophy in its entirety. Similarly, a commentary upon *The Key to Theosophy* enables a writer to see that "whatever one treats of, whatever one speaks of" is bound to be nothing more than a certain emphasis, optimistically selected in the hope that it will highlight various important points in the text.

If we are to carry out the implication of those of her statements which presented her Theosophy as but a "fragment" or "portion" of all that might be designated by that name, we may think that H.P.B. was doing *her* "treating and speaking" with full awareness of the temporal and spatial limitations of each point of emphasis *she* selected. As students, we are seldom so self-conscious, all too easily allowing ourselves to feel, first, that in grasping some relatively comprehensive summary made by H. P. Blavatsky at one point in time, we have grasped the whole of Theosophy on the subject under discussion, and, second, that we qualify to disseminate that particular idea accurately. If there are those capable of conceiving themselves as likely candidates for such delusions, an attempt at commentary on the *Key* seems recommendable as an excellent cure.

Such considerations would seem of considerable importance if one is to understand H.P.B.'s first representation, in the *Key* and elsewhere, of the necessity of Theosophists to rid themselves of sectarian tendencies. For one thing, a "sectarian tendency" is clearly the mistaken notion that one comprehends "all" that needs to be known on any given subject, and that, secure in the companionship of others who know this same "all," one is blessed by a superior mental existence. Mr. Judge spoke of the "non-sectarianism H.P.B. died to start," and, in regard to the *Key,* we may also speak of that non-sectarianism which H.P.B. *lived* every day of her life, and through the medium of all of her

• • • •

writings. In glancing back over *The Key to Theosophy* in its entirety, while making no attempt to focus attention upon any particular passages or subjects, one of the first things demanding our attention is her selection of "dialogue" as the means to present Theosophical perspectives and doctrines. It is obvious enough that H.P.B. herself wrote all of the "queries" and "objections" raised by "Enq.," but unless one stops to ponder this fact for a moment, and notes her evident sympathy for the sort of mind she is depicting in "Enq.," something in the pervading tone of the *Key* may be missed: The "enquirer," as H.P.B. represents him, is no fool. He makes cogent points and raises logically legitimate objections to her replies; in other words, he possesses a high level of intellectual integrity, and even though he is not prepared to accept Theosophy as a "new faith" for himself, he is willing to listen to a fairly put presentation.

These particular commentaries in THEOSOPHY have entirely omitted discussion of H.P.B.'s doctrinal presentations in the central section of the book. Yet in these sections, just as in those dealing with the Theosophical Society, or with practical applications of Theosophical principles to problems of education, politics, and social reform, we discover a measured balance between the agnosticism of the "Enquirer" and the phrasings H.P.B. chooses for provisional answers to the questions. The first few pages under the heading of "Theosophical Teachings as to the Nature of Man," for instance, continue the tone of impartiality set earlier in the book. On page 86, after listening to H.P.B. present the rationale of intelligent evolution proceeding on other planets, the enquirer—H.P.B. herself!—asks: "What are your data for this assertion?" H.P.B. then admits that "science in general will never accept as proof the cumulative testimony of an endless series of seers," but continues by suggesting the possibility of an ultimate synthesis in methodology. The "*methods* used by our scholars and students in the psycho-spiritual sciences," she writes, "do not differ from those of students of the natural and physical sciences."

Whenever the "Enquirer," seeming a little stunned by some of the Eastern doctrines presented, refers to them as "strange theories," H.P.B. consistently endeavors to indicate that theosophical presentations are not *meant* to represent any truth pertaining to nature or man in final exactitude or entirety. The only claim is that there *are* fundamental principles or laws of nature, and that theosophical doctrines help to

illuminate them. On page 87, in reference to some material in *Esoteric Buddhism* which H.P.B. is defending, she writes:

> These theories may be slightly incorrect in their minor details, and even faulty in their exposition by lay students; they are *facts* in nature, nevertheless, and come nearer the truth than any scientific hypothesis.

A constant sensitivity to the temperament of rational enquirers into Theosophy is illustrated also in many of H.P.B.'s articles. Her *Philosophers and Philosophicules,* first published in 1889, derives its central thesis from an attempt to throw light upon one of the many paradoxes of theosophical exposition. Here we have one of the most thought-provoking passages H.P.B. ever wrote, one which demonstrates that "doctrine" and "dogma" are never synonymous terms for the true Theosophist. Again adopting the attitude of "enquirer," H.P.B. willingly admits an "apparent" contradiction, which she presents in this fashion:

> In the published "Constitution and Rules" great stress is laid upon the absolutely non-sectarian character of the Society. It is constantly insisted upon that it has no creed, no philosophy, no religion, no dogmas, and even no special views of its own to advocate, still less to impose on its members. And yet—
>
> "Why, bless us! is it not as undeniable a fact that certain very definite views of a philosophic and, strictly speaking, of a religious character are held by the Founders and most prominent members of the Society?"
>
> "Verily so," we answer. "But where is the alleged *contradiction* in this? Neither the Founders, nor the 'most prominent members,' nor yet the majority thereof, constitute *the* Society, but only a certain portion of it, which, moreover, having no creed as a body, yet allows its members to believe as and what they please." In answer to this, we are told:—
>
> "Very true; yet these doctrines are collectively called 'Theosophy.' What is your explanation of this?"
>
> We reply:—"To call them so is a 'collective' mistake; one of those loose applications of terms to things that ought to be more carefully defined; and the neglect of members to do so is now bearing its fruits. In fact it is an oversight as harmful as that which followed the confusion of the two terms 'buddhism' and 'bodhism,' leading the Wisdom philosophy to be mistaken for the religion of Buddha."
>
> But it is still urged that when these doctrines are examined it becomes very clear that all the work which the Society as a body has done in the East and the West depended upon them. This is obviously

• • • •

> true in the case of the doctrine of the underlying unity of all religions and the existence, as claimed by Theosophists, of a common source called the Wisdom-religion of the secret teaching, from which, according to the same claims, all existing forms of religion are directly or indirectly derived. Admitting this, we are pressed to explain, how can the T.S. as a body be said to have no special views or doctrines to inculcate, no creed and no dogmas, when these are "the back-bone of the Society, its very heart and soul"?

Doctrines, then, have a temporal usefulness. But, as she asserted in "What is Truth?", they never should be taken as representative of any "absolute" reality. Again, in *Philosophers and Philosophicules,* she admits the continual emphasis among Western Theosophists on specific teachings, yet she calls it an "error" to suppose that even *these* teachings are the "backbone" of the Theosophical Movement:

> These teachings are most undeniably the "back-bone" of the Theosophical Societies *in the West,* but not at all in the East, where such Branch Societies number almost five to one in the West. Were these special doctrines the "heart and soul" of the whole body, then Theosophy and its T.S. would have died out in India and Ceylon since 1885—and this is surely not the case. For, not only have they been virtually abandoned at Adyar since that year, as there was no one to teach them, but while some Brahmin Theosophists were very much opposed to that teaching being made public, others—the more orthodox—positively opposed them as being inimical to their exoteric systems.

Perhaps one might conclude from all of the foregoing that H.P.B., like Socrates, was just as much interested in the asking of important questions as in providing the bases upon which individuals could answer them—or, perhaps, at the higher levels of thought, these two amount to much the same thing.

It is no easy matter to live a life that is modelled on Christ's, but it is unspeakably harder to live one's own life as truly as Christ lived his. Anyone who did this would run counter to the forces of the past, and though he might thus be fulfilling his destiny, would none the less be misjudged, derided, tortured and crucified.

—C. G. JUNG

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Invitation to Learning"

Discussions under the above heading, conducted by the Public Affairs Department of the CBS network, are well titled. This sort of adult education effort obviously makes constructive use of radio, meriting popular support. The Winter 1952-53 report of "Invitation to Learning's" weekly discussions of "Great Books and Significant Ideas" will be of especial interest to Theosophists, because of a panel discussion of the psychological and social significance of *The Bhagavad-Gita.*

A Common Language

The theme of the Winter series was "War and Peace," with reference to books suggestive of the ethical implications of wartime killing. The panel for the *Gita* broadcast consisted of Mark Van Doren, Columbia University English Professor, Pierre Szamek, critic and lecturer, and Lyman Bryson, Permanent Chairman of the program. Mr. Van Doren's spontaneous remarks are particularly notable, and of the three commentators he seems the most determined to establish a common denominator between Eastern and Western aspirations by means of the *philosophy* of the *Gita.* After a summary of the "plot" of the *Gita* for the benefit of the radio audience—with obvious allusions to Krishna's recommendation that Arjuna fight out the field in "lawful war"—Mr. Van Doren deplored exaggerating "the extent to which the song, the Bhagavad-Gita, is about the question whether 'A' should kill 'B' ":

> Doesn't it go on from that point to become almost as abstract as it is possible to be? The question is generalized until it covers not merely this specific predicament in which Arjuna finds himself.
>
> *Szamek:* It is, indeed!
>
> *Van Doren:* It ultimately concerns the predicament of men in general in the world when they want to know why they should do anything.
>
> *Szamek:* Well, from there the problem passes on to all of the aspects of human endeavor—to action, to knowledge, to meditation, to matter and causality, to evil and reality, and it leaves us, I think, with a rather involved sense of bewilderment because when we think we have the answer it slips away. It's all amorphous; it's all quicksilver. It's a difficult thing to comprehend, this Sanskritic mind.

• • • •

Van Doren: So is the human mind, isn't it? I mean, is there such a thing as the Sanskritic mind, seriously?

Bryson: You mean the inscrutable Oriental doesn't seem to you a very real person, Mr. Van Doren?

"They're All Inscrutable"

Van Doren: Well, the inscrutable Western, the inscrutable Occidental, they're all inscrutable. The mind, when it is serious and when it is really trying to answer the most difficult of all questions, whether it's one question or several, becomes an inscrutable thing, because the questions are inscrutable. I had a very interesting experience when I was reading this book again. I kept thinking of western poets and philosophers who were not too different in their thought from whomever it was wrote this song. I don't mean to say that one copied the other or anything of that sort, but I suspect that the human mind, when it is at grips with one of the most difficult questions of all, is nothing more or less than the human mind.

Bryson: It's the trivialities that make the difference and cause the wars, Mr. Van Doren?

Van Doren: I find Dante here, I find Plato here, I find Jesus here, I find some American writers. I wonder whether this famous difference between the west and the east is really profound. It's an important difference, but maybe its crucial importance and its dangerous importance is in connection with the trivialities.

Hidden Subtleties

The usual tendency in discussion of the *Gita* is to emphasize the "activism" of the West and the "passivism" of the East, but here, again, Mr. Van Doren demurred, and, seeking a universal philosophical meaning, said, "If the *Gita* were read in terms of its greatest abstractions it would yield something like the Golden Rule." Sanskritist Pierre Szamek concedes this point and the discussion continues:

Szamek: There is a Golden Rule in the *Gita,* a very distinctly phrased Golden Rule. As a matter of fact, the philosophy it expresses is an extremely lofty one. The Golden Rule is: "He is supreme, oh, mighty one, who looks on the pleasure and pain of all beings as he looks on them in himself." And this is from one of the passages in the *Gita* itself, clearly stated.

Van Doren: I kept thinking about these parallels not just for the fun of it, but because I really do believe it's important to discover that the human mind is the same everywhere.

While Theosophists may feel that such treatment of the *Gita's* philosophical message still falls far short of William Q. Judge's commen-

taries, both the program and Mr. Van Doren's efforts are clearly useful. All that is needed is a further "reading between the lines," as recommended by Mr. Judge.

The Esoteric Discourse

Edmond Taylor's comments on the *Gita* in *Richer by Asia* indicated his awareness of further dimensions of thought in the great epic poem. Taylor saw the great civil war between the Pandus and Kurus as merely background for a profound philosophical treatment of man's nature. In his chapter "New Wine in Old Bottles" Taylor wrote:

> The hero of the poem, the dispossessed prince, Arjuna, is called upon to do battle with his kinsmen and friends for the recovery of his rightful heritage. Like Hamlet, like many confused liberals of modern times, Arjuna is torn between contradictory ideals and duties, and falls into a state of neurotic depression upon the eve of battle. The god, Krishna, appears and, somewhat in the manner of a modern psychiatrist, teaches Arjuna to reconcile his inner conflicts, to accomplish his duty as a warrior without betraying the more spiritual values of Hindu culture, including the ideal of nonviolence. Depending upon what element of Krishna's teaching one considers the most essential, the poem can be read as a tract in favor of integral nonviolence or as a dialectic for justifying violence in a righteous cause.

The War Within Man

With Judge's rendition of the *Gita* receiving more attention as interest in Eastern philosophy increases, we may perhaps yet see such a point of view as the following in contemporary presentation. In his *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita* (p. 16), Judge writes:

> The enumeration of generals and commanders gone into by the prime minister in reply to the king must be a catalogue of all the lower and higher faculties in man, containing also, in the names adopted, clues to powers of our being only at present dimly guessed at in the West or included in such vague terms as *Brain* and *Mind*. We find these generals given their appropriate places upon either side, and see also that they have assigned to them various distinctive weapons, which in many cases are flourished or exhibited in the preliminary movements, so that our attention may be drawn to them. . . .

Eastern and Western Psychology

The January issue of the sometimes excellent quarterly journal, *Philosophy East and West,* contains an article of especial interest to

• • • •

many Theosophical students. Entitled "Samskaras in Yoga Philosophy and Western Psychology," it is N. Mishra's presentation of the "dynamics of karma"—a discussion which seems well worth reading and pondering, both because of its attempt to synthesize Eastern and Western humanistic psychological concepts, and because it indicates that the study of Karma is indeed a science in and of itself.

In her *Glossary,* Mme. Blavatsky defines Samskaras thus:

> SAMSKARA *(Sk.). Lit.,* from *Sam* and *Kri,* to improve, refine, impress. In Hindu philosophy the term is used to denote the impressions left upon the mind by individual actions or external circumstances, and capable of being developed on any future favourable occasion—even in a future birth. The *Samskara* denotes, therefore, the germs of propensities and impulses from previous births to be developed in this, or the coming *Janmas* or reincarnations. In Tibet, *Samskara* is called Doodyed, and in China is defined as, or at least connected with, action or Karma. It is, strictly speaking, a metaphysical term, which in exoteric philosophies is variously defined; *e.g.,* in Nepaul as illusion, in Tibet as notion, and in Ceylon as discrimination. The true meaning is as given above, and as such is connected with Karma. . . .

BACK TO PATANJALI

A lecturer in philosophy at Patna University, Mr. Mishra begins his definition similarly, incidentally explaining the intent of his analysis:

> The concept of *Samskara,* which is closely connected with that of *karma,* occupies an important place in Indian culture in general and particularly in the Yoga philosophy of Patanjali. This term has been translated by various scholars into the English word "impression," which, however, does not bring out its true import. The term "impression," implies that *samskara* is a static stamp imprinted on the mind-stuff. But the *Yoga-sutras* and the commentaries on them by Vyasa and Vacaspati point out that the *samskara* is a force. The object of this paper is to bring out the correct import of this concept by a critical and comparative study in the light of Indian and Western thought and to discover its approximate parallel in Western psychology.

A USEFUL TERMINOLOGY

The utility of a concept such as the *samskaras,* in addition to that of the skandhas, may at once be evident, but the longer one considers the mysterious nature of karmic fluctuations in one's own psychological life, the more may such distinctions be seen to be helpful. Mr. Mishra, for instance, demonstrates how the concept of *samskaras* can explain

why in the case of a man "who has acquired some virtue by performing good actions," and who takes to evil deeds later on, "the vice so generated will not bear its fruits so long as it does not overpower and annul the previously acquired virtue. If it happens that the newly acquired vice is stronger and more potent than the previous virtue, the vice will completely overpower the virtue and will bear its fruit at once. This is clearly indicative of the kinetic character of the vehicles of action."

Attitudinal Psychology

Mr. Mishra also demonstrates that Western psychology has only recently been approaching its subject-matter from a standpoint easily assimilable to Eastern philosophy. The term *samskaras,* for instance, cannot be equated with "instincts," with "drives," with "reflexes," with "motives," nor anything "innate." However, modern psychological use of the word *attitude,* now coming into greater currency, can, if used in disciplined fashion, be regarded as an equivalent of *samskara.* That such a word is now utilized frequently indicates a more philosophical tone. Mishra explains:

A Directive Force

> An attitude is a tendency to act. The term designates a certain proclivity or bent, a bias or predisposition, an aptitude or inclination, to a certain type of activity.
>
> An attitude, generally speaking, is a residuum of experience by which further activity is conditioned and controlled. An inner mental organization takes place which predisposes the person to a certain type of activity toward objects, persons, and situations.
>
> An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.
>
> If we closely examine the above definitions, we shall find that a clear distinction has been made between "the tendency to act" and "the activity proper." Their mutual or circular causation has also been pointed out in the second definition, and this corresponds well with the mutual or circular causation of *samskara* and *vrtti* referred to earlier. Attitudes, as indicated by the above definitions, are directive, dynamic, and predisposing, and so are the *samskaras* unless weakened by contrary forces. We have found *samskaras* to be potential states of the mind as distinguished from manifest mental activities, and so are attitudes.

• • • •

Inward Readiness

Andras Angyal, a psychologist quoted by Mishra, offers a more detailed description:

> The concepts of drive and craving refer to dynamic patterns in the state of actual functioning. However, as a rule, dynamic patterns do not function continuously, but only when certain specific situations arise. . . . The organism is, however, characterized by the *readiness* to certain types of behavior. This readiness is activated whenever the proper situation arises and becomes an actual drive. The readiness to behave in certain specific ways we shall call *attitude*. . . . While a drive is a feature of an actual activity, attitudes refer to potentialities, to the readiness of the organism to behave in certain ways whenever the proper situation arises. . . . Besides drives which are active at a given moment we have to consider also the *potential* dynamic features of the organism, that is, its attitudes, the various forms of readiness for certain activities.

Complementary Terms

Mr. Mishra concludes by remarking that, "In the light of the above discussion, one may feel very strongly inclined to identify *samskaras* with attitudes. Both are potential, dynamic, and unconscious, and both can also be innate or acquired. But there are difficulties here also. There are many psychologists who would regard attitudes as both conscious and unconscious, as there are many who would regard all attitudes as acquired. But, in the light of the discussion above, there are strong reasons in favor of their being taken as almost identical."

It is to be hoped that other Indian scholars will take advantage of such opportunities as those presented by *Philosophy East and West* to demonstrate that the "wisdom of the ancients" was a detailed and disciplined science. To associate Eastern thought exclusively with vague mysticism is no more than bland ignorance.

Expanding Brotherhood in Theosophy

Theosophists all over the world, regardless of organizational affiliation, will be able to respond with appreciation to the sentiments contained in an address delivered on Dec. 26, 1952, before the 77th International Convention of the Theosophical Society by retiring President C. Jinarajadasa. A member of the Society for 58 years, Mr. Jinarajadasa's address seems distinctive in its impartial treatment of Theosophical history. No "rival" Theosophical organization or associa-

tions are maligned, and the emphasis is upon those principles which H.P.B. regarded as crucial to the success of Theosophical endeavor. The following is an adequate example of the tone established:

Essential Unity

> The real basis for a Universal Brotherhood is not our human nature with its sufferings and joys and needs, but rather our common Divine Nature which makes us all one Unity which can never be dissolved. If in the course of the next twenty-three years our Lodges will proclaim to men this fundamental teaching of the Divinity hidden in all mankind, we shall charge the invisible atmosphere with a new idea that there is an essential Unity of mankind, quite distinct from what is enunciated in the Charter of Human Rights. I might say that there is another and far more vital charter—the Charter of the Divine Right of each individual being.
>
> Once again, it is my firm conviction that we Theosophists, even though we abstain from politics, yet have a most vital contribution to make for the welfare of humanity. It is indeed for this work that the Adept Brotherhood, which guided the formation of The Theosophical Society, reiterated again and again that the work of the Society fundamentally is to make a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood. For as was stated, it is only on the basis of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity that slowly there can be created a *Universal Morality.* When all nations accept this Universal Morality, binding on all, high and low alike, then indeed will the world have an era not only of Peace, but of true happiness.

Reference to William Q. Judge

Of special interest to students of William Q. Judge in general and members of U.L.T. in particular is Mr. Jinarajadasa's summary of the famous "Judge controversy." The relevant portion of Mr. Jinarajadasa's historical summary follows:

> The fourth seven-year cycle began in 1896, but the previous year, in 1895, the Society was plunged into a great crisis. Towards the end of 1894 there had been rumors in connection with the Society's Vice-President, W. Q. Judge, that he had sent to various members communications purporting to be from the Masters, but actually not precipitated by the Adepts, but written by his own hand in the two well-known scripts. So strong was the feeling on the matter that at the Convention held at Adyar in 1894 a Resolution was passed asking the President-Founder to take action in the matter. This he did in London in 1895, and Mr. Judge was asked to explain his action, which of course he denied. Then an important principle was established in

• • • •

> connection with this enquiry of the "Judicial Committee" before which Mr. Judge appeared. Mr. Judge declared that to enquire into the charges against him would mean that the Society would thereby definitely commit itself to a belief in the existence of the Mahatmas. Colonel Olcott saw at once the significance of this demurrer by Mr. Judge, and decided that the Judicial Committee had no authority to enquire into the matter of the charges, since the Society was in no way bound to the idea of the existence of the Masters.

While Mr. Jinarajadasa does not here convey to his audience the beneath-the-surface aspects of the attack on Mr. Judge, nor indicate the tragic consequences which resulted for the Society, he does provide, without prejudicial comment, a brief outline of the facts concerning the "Judicial Enquiry," the very simplicity of which emphasizes the impossibility of any organizational determination of Theosophical "beliefs"—which was Judge's main contention—and illustrates, also, the inviolability of individual thought and conviction in Theosophy. It is to be hoped that some members of the Theosophical Society, reading these words of its retiring President, may be led to reflect anew on the role of William Q. Judge in the Theosophical Movement.

The Low State of TV

In the Radio Section of the New York *Times* for Oct. 19, columnist Jack Gould makes an evaluation of present-day Radio and TV entertainment that is shared, no doubt, by countless thousands of listeners from coast to coast. Few individual set-owners have the privilege, unfortunately, of expressing their views in print. If they did, some perhaps would go even farther than Mr. Gould in the arraignment of a type and quality of programming that is doing more to lower the standard of intellectual pastime than any single feature of entertainment since the electronic medium came of age. Says Mr. Gould:

High Hopes for Video Vanishing

> Let's face it; television is getting pretty bad. The high hopes for video which were held by so many are vanishing before our eyes. The medium is heading hell-bent for the rut of innocuity, mediocrity and sameness that made a drab if blatant jukebox of radio. The success of TV is proving a hollow jest. . . .
>
> Remember the proud words . . . of how television represented a vital new form of electronic theatre that augured an exciting and challenging new cultural era? Or how the imperishable wonders of a vibrant and articulate stage would be spread to the far corners of the land?

> Look at the television giant this season. Morning, noon and night the channels are cluttered with eye-wearying monstrosities . . . half-hour aberrations that in story and action would make an erstwhile Hollywood producer of "B" pictures shake his head in dismay.

What Do "We" Suggest?

Mr. Gould's pointed criticism is addressed primarily to broadcasters in the effort to arouse them to a sense of their responsibility. "If only in economic self-defense, sponsors and broadcasters," he says, "must now embark on a program of research and experimentation in television programming." But how can solution to a problem which is cultural and moral in its nature be found at the commercial and economic levels of research—at least as long as people will accept such inferior entertainment? Many present-day writers and dramatists produce works of inspirational value, but their efforts must be appreciated before public demand can ensue. More reading, and more discussion of what we read, can certainly help toward this end, as can specific, well-worded recommendation to TV program sponsors. Finally, if broadcasters could be made to realize what they are doing to the impressionable nature of the rising generation, perhaps they would see the wisdom of featuring better material.

As always, ultimate solution of the problem no doubt rests with the individual, or, in this case, with the individual family. Shall we, or shall we not, own a TV set? If so, which programs shall we select for our children and ourselves? Should children be allowed unlimited use of radio and television, or should their time be controlled? These are questions which face the parents of today—the responsibility of safeguarding the moral, mental and psychic well-being of their children.

"Literary" Homicide

Writing in similar vein, though in a tone of apology for the broadcaster, John Crosby, in the March 1 issue of the New York *Herald Tribune,* devotes his column to some interesting statistics respecting "crime" and "violence" on TV programs for children.

> In Chicago, television columnist Jack Mabley stirred up a hubbub by printing the results of a local survey which showed an incidence of some 295 violent crimes on children's programs on TV within one week. The uproar from parents was horrendous.
>
> . . . .

> Then Dallas Smythe, of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, which has Ford Foundation money to spend, came out with another report which showed Chicago was just a pantywaist in the violence department. New York children in one week in 1953 had the opportunity to watch 1,412 acts and threats of violence on television.
>
> In Los Angeles a television magazine used an even more stark reckoning than Chicago's. It counted killings only, 199 of them on children's programs in one week.
>
> There is no doubt there is too much shooting and other forms of gore on television. In fact, to my mind, there is too much of it everywhere else—in books, in comic strips, on the screen. There is also—let's face it—an awful lot of it on the streets or, as they say, in real life.
>
> That leads us to the interesting speculation as to whether the literary (including TV) homicide is a reflection of the trend of the times—or the other way around. In my mind I'm pretty well convinced the former is true.

The great majority of people, however, have never even seen a murder in real life, so that the only homicide they know is the "literary" kind. How then can it be said that the predominance of murder and violence themes on screen and TV is a reflection of real life—except for the perpetual war-slaying recounted on every front page of every paper? But whatever the origin, one thing is certain—bloodshed, hatred, and killing are not a reflection of the lives of children. And why should we poison their plastic, impressionable minds with the horrors of adult life?

Mr. Crosby continues:

> In trying to cope with the situation, the broadcaster has to go a little deeper than the arithmetic of the situation. Violence has been a part of children's literature since the dawn of time, or anyway, from the dawn of Grimm's Fairy Tales, which contains some pretty gruesome stuff. But the attitude toward violence has changed pretty markedly for the worse. In "Huckleberry Finn," for example, the mob violence scene is written with such indignation from Mark Twain as to constitute a moral preachment. In today's literature, violence is presented matter-of-factly as a plot device like a clinch between lovers.

Mr. Crosby is markedly pessimistic, perhaps too much so, but he at least concludes with hope and humor.

> It's my hope [he writes] the kids will remedy this themselves by eventually getting tired of the same old stuff, turning off the set and reading a book.

Rejection of School Bible Reading

A meeting of the legislative committee of the California Teachers' Association, concluding its session on March 1 in San Francisco, refused to approve proposed legislation "granting local Boards of Education the authority to require readings from the Bible in all classrooms." The general consensus of feeling in the CTA, according to a Los Angeles *Times* writer, was that the word *"require"* clearly "opens the door to the pressure groups." A report on a committee discussion states:

> The subcommittee, in turning thumbs down, pointed out that they are already teaching moral and spiritual values, that Bible reading in any form would only produce controversy and conflict, and that no parent should be placed in the position of having to write a note to the teacher asking that his child be excused from class during Bible reading. That, they pointed out, would be a violation of the Constitutional guarantee of religious freedom.

Some Educators are Philosophers

While the outcome of the CTA's deliberations will be pleasing to Theosophists for obvious reasons, equally important is the fact that the CTA Committee discussions of this controversial issue contained much of philosophical percipience and depth. Jack Reese, superintendent of schools at Hayward, indicated that when all political pros and cons have been examined, the issue boils down to whether we wish our children to be "immediately divided along religious lines," something our American traditions view with abhorrence. C. C. Trillingham, Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, pointed out that the whole matter of teaching moral values becomes involved, and that whenever legislation presupposes that moral values are best gained in any one particular manner, and creates institutions to implement its recommendations by legal means, the rights of those who may differ are infringed upon.

The same CTA session, incidentally, voted on similar grounds to oppose legislative efforts to institutionalize teacher opinion. They concluded that the "Dilworth Bill,"dealing with dismissal or suspension of teachers on grounds based on investigations into Communist activities "opened the door to regimentation of academic freedom."

Protestant Opposition

The February issue of *Church and State,* monthly organ of "Protestants and other Americans United for Separation of Church and State,"

provides a good sampling of the informative service this journal is performing. The editorial page comments on remarks made in *Our Sunday Visitor*—a paper advertised as the most widely circulated Catholic weekly in the world. The Jan. 25 *Visitor* declared disarmingly:

> We have never met a Catholic who would want union of Church and State in this country even though it could be achieved. We have never met anyone who does not believe in the necessity of the public school system for the one-half of the population in our country which is unaffiliated with any church and for the millions of Protestants who are not inclined to open schools of their own.

To this the *Church and State* writer wryly comments, "It would seem that introductions are in order. Bishop Noll and his colleagues on the *Visitor* should without further delay make the acquaintance of Roman Catholic parochial school administrators in many communities who have accepted direct public tax support for their sectarian institutions."

THE FACTUAL RECORD

Attention is then called to statistics indicating that the Catholic program for a religion enforced by State authority is still much in evidence:

> —In Colorado, where District Judge George C. Twombley ruled that there is "no separation of Church and State" at St. Peter's school in the town of Fleming, although the school had been declared "public" by complaisant school board members.
>
> —In Minnesota, where the state board of education withheld state funds from three schools in Morrison and Ottertail Counties because "the influence of denominational, religious symbols and texts, the distinctive doctrines, creeds, or tenets" of the Roman Catholic Church were paramount.
>
> —In Michigan, where "overpayments" of state aid to the Lake Linden school district were recovered by the state superintendent of public instruction following discovery that parochial school pupils had been included in the district's report on the number of enrolled pupils.
>
> —In Missouri, where direct state support of 25 parochial schools in 18 counties was ruled unconstitutional by Circuit Judge Emmett J. Crouse of St. Joseph.
>
> —In Wisconsin, where direct state support of 14 parochial schools was withdrawn by the state schools superintendent after a taxpayers' group had filed formal complaint.
>
> These examples could be multiplied. For every case brought to end sectarian misuse of public funds, there are a dozen other comparable situations which remain uncorrected.